## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Snaneen Cabbagestark, # 295567,	) C/A No. 5:15-338/-RMG-KDW
Plaintiff,	)
vs.	) ) ORDER
Deputy Warden Willie Davis;	) ORDER
Sgt Ms Smith;	)
Ms Angela Smith;	)
All SMU Supervisors;	)
All Staff work night shift and day shift on SMU southside;	)
IGC Ms L Johnson;	)
Warden Denis Bush;	)
DHO Ms Sharon Patterson;	)
Sgt Ms Karen Gregg;	)
Ms Desi,principal of education building, and	)
Lt Marquez,	)
	)
Defendants.	)
	)

This is a civil action filed by a state prisoner. Therefore, in the event that a limitations issue arises, Plaintiff shall have the benefit of the holding in *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266 (1988) (prisoner's pleading was filed at the moment of delivery to prison authorities for forwarding to district court). Under Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) of the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, pretrial proceedings in this action have been referred to the assigned United States Magistrate Judge.

By Order dated January 27, 2014, Plaintiff was directed to submit items to bring this case into proper form. ECF No. 9. Plaintiff complied with the Order and the case is now in proper form.

## **MOTION FOR PROTECTION:**

Plaintiff submitted a document requesting that this court "secure and do not display any of my valuable information . . ." and citing to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2. ECF No. 12. As indicated in the "warning to pro se party or nonparty filers" document that the court provides to all pro se litigants ("privacy warning"), a copy of which is attached to Plaintiff's Motion, it is the responsibility of the litigant to take precautions to protect his or her own confidential information when filing documents with the court. It is not the court's obligation to do so. Plaintiff has not specified what he considers to be his "valuable information" and the court in unaware of anything submitted by Plaintiff showing that he has, personally, taken any of the protective steps outlined in the privacy warning with regard to any personal information contained in his filings in this case.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Protection, ECF No. 12, is **denied**.

## **MOTION TO AMEND**:

On January 30, 2014, Plaintiff submitted a Motion to Amend Complaint. ECF No.16. Based on the court's recommendation for summary dismissal (*see* Report and Recommendation filed contemporaneously herewith), Plaintiff's Motion to Amend, ECF No. 16, is **denied without prejudice**.

## TO THE CLERK OF COURT:

Unless Plaintiff pays the full filing fee within the time permitted by the court, this case is subject to summary dismissal under the three-strikes rule. Therefore, the Clerk of Court shall <u>not</u> issue any summonses nor shall the Clerk of Court forward this matter to the United States Marshal for service of process at this time.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February 24, 2014 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West United States Magistrate Judge

Stayme D. Host